G.R.S. IX—5]

Previous references.
Gen 76-22-(1-2)
" 4-22-1
" 76-22 (3-6)
Later references.
Gen 29-23 (3-4)
" 88-23 (1, 3-11)
" 18-24 (1-2)

1923-24. (Geological)

File No. 29-23.
Serial Nos. 1—2.

~~Destroy~~ preserve

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(24)

Serial Nos. 2

Part B for 1923

SUBJECT

Memorial of Mrs. Khani Begum, Jahagirdar of Sadkattur Inam village, Mysore Taluk, for the grant of certain mineral concessions.

1.2. To Mrs. Khani Begum c/o Mr. Hyder Ali Khan, Supdt of Police, Chickmagalur. No. I.C. 1960 d. 15.10.23.

With refce to the above, informs her that there are no reasons to recommend the orders already passed in the matter and communicated to her on 23rd August 1923.

MN.
5.11.23.

878.

G. R. S. III-21

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Govt File No. 29 of 1923.

Serial No.

1

From the Private Secretary to H. H. the Maharaja
403 dt 31-8-23.

Forwards the application of Mrs Khair Begum requesting reconsideration of the order of Govt that her rights to minerals in Dodkallu in an village maybe resumed & that she maybe given a prospecting licence for chrome as prayed for or in the alternative she maybe reimbursed with the amount of Rs 35000/- actually spent by her in purchasing the rights of the co-sharers in the village.

Submitted with connected papers for order.

A.H.G.
12-9-23

The applicant has not established any claim to the land as stated in her present application

She has a right to prospect on this land under the terms of the lease granted to her but has no right to claim any compensation in the event of her failing to obtain any minerals

13.9.23

2nd Member

Action may perhaps be taken as at A

14/9/23

Yes please see me on a day next week

17/9

17/9

38/
17.9.23

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

878

G. R. S. III-21

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Gen File No. 29 of 1923.

Serial No.

Submitted with a D.F.N.

19.9.23. 20.9.23

Send draft as issued

Submitted with a typed draft as revised

22.9.23.

Send with a draft and a D/N

22.9.23.

22-9-23

The petitioner has addressed a memorial to His Highness praying for a ~~reconsideration~~ modification of the order ~~passed~~ made on August last (with the concurrence of the Dewan) rejecting his application.

As the petitioner appears in person frequently approaches His Highness with a representation of his case, a Memorandum was ~~submitted~~ explaining to him that His case is now under reference to His Highness by the Dewan and directing him to do so

Dewan

24

DEWAN'S OFFICE.
Recd. on SEP 26 1923
Reg. No. 2061

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Final Note by the Second Member of Council.

Subject:-

Memorial of Mrs. Khani Begum, Jahgirdar of Dodkattur Inam Village in the Mysore Taluk for the grant of certain mineral concessions.

The accompanying papers relate to the requests of Mrs. Khani Begum Jahgirdar of Dodkattur Inam Village in the Mysore Taluk for

(1) the restoration to her of mineral rights in the village, and

(2) the grant of a prospecting license for chrome. Mrs. Khani Begum further prays that in case the above requests are not granted, she may be paid a sum of Rs.35,000/- spent by her in purchasing the rights of other shareholders in the village in the hope of obtaining a license for chrome.

2. An application was received from the petitioner in August 1920 for a license for chrome and magnesite in the village but it was on the recommendation of Dr. Smeeth rejected by Government on 24th September 1920 as it was proposed by Government to reserve chrome. In July 1921 another application was received from her. At the same time certain other shareholders of the inam village had also applied for licenses but Government directed on 10th September 1921 that in view of the proprietory disputes connected with the inam village no license in favour of any one of the shareholders should be issued. In January 1923 the petitioner again applied for a prospecting license for chrome and magnesite in the village stating that she had purchased the shares of other inamdars at considerable expenditure. Government however sanctioned on 9th May 1923 the grant of a license for magnesite only but rejected the application for chrome as that mineral was reserved by Government throughout the State.

3. The petitioner thereupon requested in May 1923 for a reconsideration of the Government Order of 9th May 1923 and urged for (1) the restoration to her of mining rights in general in the village and

and (2) the grant of a prospecting license for chrome.

4. As regards the first request it has been more than once decided that the question cannot be reopened as the claim is time-barred. Mr. Hyder Ali Khan (the husband of Mrs. Khani Begum) had also agreed that he would not press the claim for mining rights as Inamdar.

5. As regards the grant of a prospecting license for chrome, since the Government informed the petitioner and her rival claimants that no licenses or leases in respect of any mineral would be granted until and unless the proprietory disputes among them were brought to a settlement, they had subsequently decided in their orders dated 6th November 1922 and 29th January 1923 to reserve chrome and manganese and a few other essential minerals throughout the State and not to permit exploitation of these minerals by private persons.

P & T

6. The petitioner claimed, however, exemption from the operation of these orders on the ground that hopes had been held out to her about the grant of 4 prospecting licenses for minerals ~~in case~~ a satisfactory settlement of the proprietory disputes in the village was come to between the contending claimants and that on the strength of these hopes she had purchased at considerable cost the rights of the other claimants to the village.

7. Though the order declining to grant a license till the proprietory rights about the village were settled was issued in September 1921 no report of the settlement of the disputes was made by any of the claimants before the issue of the reservation orders referred to above, and even the settlement now stated to have been affected by the petitioner is disputed by some other claimants who have also petitioned to Government protesting against the grant of the license applied for by her.

8. In the circumstances, after carefully considering the entire facts of the case it was considered that no exception should be made in favour of the petitioner in the matter of exploiting minerals. She was accordingly informed on 23rd August 1923 that her claim for mineral rights

in the village which was put forward more than quarter of a century after the expiry of the period allowed by law therefor could not be allowed and that it was not possible to grant the license for chrome applied for by her.

9. The petitioner urges in her present application the same arguments as before. There appear to be no reasonable grounds either to reconsider the orders already passed in the matter or to grant her [redacted] request to be reimbursed for the expenditure incurred by her in purchasing the rights of the other shareholders in the village The papers are submitted for His Highness' gracious perusal.

24th September 1923.

OFFG: SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL.

24/9/23

Submitted to His Highness.

I submit herewith a Final Note by the..Second.....

Member of Council on the subject of.Memorial..of...Mrs.Khani Begum,...Jahgirdar...of...Dodkattur...Inam...Village...in..Mysore Taluk, for the grant of certain mineral concessions.....

for His Highness' gracious ~~approval~~ perusal.

Dewan.

27 SEP 1943

878 7

Record of Cases submitted for the Orders of His Highness the Maharaja

Subject.

Memorial of Mrs.Khani Begum, Jahgirdar of Dodkattur Inam Village, Mysore Taluk, for the grant of certain mineral concessions.

168
27-9-23

252

Order.

~~KRW~~

29/9/23

Secy

30 SEP 1923

1/10-23.

1/10/23

8-78

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. Geo (File No. 29 of 1923.

Serial No.	
	Submitted into a draft endorsement.
	Asst 13-10-23.
2	Fr Khan Bahadur Begum

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT
13 OCT 1923
INDUSTRIES & COMMERCE BRANCH.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

0915 ? GOL 29-23-1

No. 403

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY
TO HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,

Mysore, 31-8-1923.

D. 878

GEN. & SEV. SECTT. ASST.
1 SEP 1923
SEP 1923
INDUSTRIES & COMMERCE
BRANCH.

Petition, as shown below, to His Highness the Maharaja is transferred to the Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, ~~.....Department~~, Bangalore, ~~for~~ in continuation of Memo No. 27 dated 4.7.1923.

By Order,

~~Asst.~~ *Private Secretary*
to H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore.

No. 112 of 23-24.

W D, 204—GBPM—1,000—13-9-22

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY
112
31 AUG. 1923
TO H. THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

To

His Highness Sir Sree Krishnaraja Wadiyar Bahadur G.C.S.I.,

Maharaja of Mysore.

May it please Your Highness,

The humble memorial of meherban Khani Begum Sahibee. Jaghirdar of Dodkattur Inam village, sister of the present Ruling Chief of Savanur and wife of Mr. Hyder Ali Khan, Superintendent of Police. residing in Fort, Bangalore City, most respectfully sheweth:-

That the memorialist approached your Highness in July 1923 with a memorial (copy of which is submitted herewith for ready reference) praying for (a) the restoration of the right to minerals in her Jaghir village of Dodkattur and (b) the immediate grant of a license to her to prospect for chrome in the said village pending the settlement of the first quastion of the restoration of the right to minerals.

2. That the memorialist had also submitted an application in May 1923 to the Secretary to Government, General Department in the terms of the said memorial and that she has now received an endorsement No. I.C. 972/ Geol. 76-22-6 dated 23rd August 1923 from the said officer (submitted herewith in original) refusing to allow her claim for mineral rights and also to grant the prospecting license applied for by her for chrome.

3. That the ground urged for the refusal of the mineral rights is that the claim is put forward nearly 29 years after the expiry of the time allowed by law. The memorialist has clearly explained in para 6 of her previous memorial the several circumstances under which she is fairly entitled to an indulgent consideration in the matter and she prays that this question which is one of general importance may kindly be reconsidered

on broad lines and favourable orders issued at an early date.

4. That the question which the memorialist most urgently begs leave to appeal about is the immediate grant to her of the license applied for ~~by her~~ to prospect for chrome. The refusal to grant even the license is based upon Government Order No. I. C. 4728-34/ Geol. 47-22-8, dated 29th January 1923, which extends the reservation of chrome ore by Government throughout the State. A deeper consideration of the memorialist's case will show that the reservation by Government was never intended to apply to or at least affect the memorialist. In support of this statement the following facts are submitted for Your Highness gracious consideration:-

(a) A license to prospect for chrome in the Inam village of Dodkattur had been previously granted by Government to the Jaghirdars in 1918, but was not renewed owing to proprietory disputes then existing among the Inamdars.

(b) There were also licenses granted in the same Inam village before 1918, to other parties, viz., (1) Messrs Tata Iron & Steel Co., Ltd and (2) Messrs Oakley Bowden & Co., both of whom have not yet been able to arrange terms with the Jaghirdars in respect of the surface rights and consequently to work the blocks.

(c) Being anxious to work for chrome ore which has of late years fetching a good price in the market, the memorialist purchased at a considerable cost the shares of certain co-inamdars in view of the refusal of Government to renew the old license on account of the proprietory disputes and also submitted a formal application to the Director of Geology in February 1920.

(d) It was only at the end of April 1920, that the Government first reserved chrome ore in certain parts of the State in which the Inam village in question was also

included. The memorialist's application having been one submitted in February 1920 , i,e, nearly three months before the reservation it was and is quote clear that the reservation should not have affected the memorialist- and on this being pointed out the Director of Geology had kindly recommended to Government the grant of the license to the memorialist. But at the same time two other remaining co-inamdars whose shares had not been purchased till then by the memorialist applied to Government for a similar license and the Government therefore declined to grant a license to any one "in view of the proprietory disputes connected with the Inam village" (vide copy of Director's letter No. 444 dated 19/20th September 1921 enclosed). There is nothing to show that the Government refused the license on account of the subsequent reservation made in April 1920.

(e) In view of the tone of the Director's letter which filled the memorialist with strong hopes of the grant of the licenseon the settlement of the proprietory disputes she purchased even the few remaining co-sharers at an enormous price of Rs. 35,000/- and is now the sole proprietress of the village in question. She also submitted the original sale deeds to the Director of Geology, who, being fully satisfied in regard to her title to the village, again recommended in January 1923 the grant of the license even after the extension of the reservation of chrome ore throughout the State. This recommendation clearly indicates that as the application for the license was submitted by the memorialist as far back as February 1920and the reservations ordered first in April 1920 and recently in January 1923 were both subsequent to the date of the said application, the Director was of the opinion that the reservation in either of these cases, could not and should not be applied to the memorialist's case.

5. That the present order declining to grant the license to the memorialist on account of the recent reservations has come to the memorialist as a bolt from the blue. She has invested her all in purchasing the co-sharers of the village in order to satisfy the Government of her absolute proprietorship for the purpose of getting the prospecting license and it would bring nothing but ruin to her if she should be unable to work for chrome as she has for all these years been earnestly contemplating to do. The memorialist is quite confident that Your Highness would never allow a most loyal and respectable Mahomedan family like hers to suffer in such a way by quibbles made in the application of Government Orders relating to the reservation of chrome ore.

That even the reservation of the mineral by Government in the village in question is far likely to be of any benifit whatever to Government either in the near or the distant future in as much as there are several difficulties also which the Government have to combat with in connection with the acquisition of the Inam lands , payment of compensation &c.,

That in conclusion the memorialist most respectfully entreats Your Highness' sympathy and gracious consideration of her position and respectability and the grant to her of the license to prospect for chrome which has been so unfairly refused on account of the reservations by Government which have been made long after her application and which cannot equitably or reasonably applied to her case.

The Memorialist also begs to add that if the Government should still maintain that the reservation in respect of her Inam village is more advantageous to them than the grant of the license to her she would most respectfully request that in return for the surface rights which she will be prepared to transfer to Government, she may at least be reimbursed with the actual amount of money (namely Rs. 35,000/-) spent by her

up

up to date in purchasing the rights of the co-sharers in the village in the hope of getting the license which the several communications from the Government led her to entertain.

For this act of kindness and generosity the memorialist shall ever pray as in duty bound for Your Highness' long life and prosperity.

She begs to remain

Your Highness' most humble and

obedient subject and servant,

Khan Begum,

Dated Bangalore

28th August 1923.

No. 444 Dated Bangalore 19/20th Sep. 1923.

From

A.M. Sen Esq., M.Sc., F.G.S., &c.,
Director in charge, Mysore Geological Department.

To

Mrs. Khani Begum Saheba,
C/o Mr. Hyder Ali Khan,
Amildar, Bangalore Taluk,
Basawangudi, Bangalore.

Madam,

With reference to your petition, dated 23rd July 1921, urging your claims for a prospecting license in the village of Dodkattur in preference to Mr. Mahomed Naziruddin Khan, I have the honour to inform you that, in view of the proprietory disputes connected with the Inam village, the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore are not disposed to grant licenses in favour of any one at present.

I have the honour to be,
Madam,
Your most obedient servant,
Sd/- A. M. Sen,
Director in Charge,
Mysore Geological Department.

" True Copy ".
Khani Begum.

"Copy"

To

Colonel His Highness Maharaja
Sir Sri Krishnaraja Wadiyar Bahadur, G.C.S.I.,G.C.B.E.
Maharaja of Mysore.

Through

Amin-ul-mulk Mirza M. Ismail Esq.B.A., O.B.E.,
Private Secretary.

The Memorial of Meherban Khani Begum Sahibae of Savanur, wife of Mr.Hyder Ali Khan, residing in Basavngudi, Bangalore city.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR HIGHNESS,

Your Highness Memorialist is the sister of the Chief of - Savanur, Dharwar District, and the sole proprietor and Jaghirdar of the Survamanya Inam village of Dudkatur in the Mysore Taluk in conjunction with her husband Mr.Hyder Ali Khan, Amildar, Mysore service.

2. That under the Sannad granted by the late Nawab Tippu Sultan of Mysore on Kartheekashuddha Dasami of the year Virodhikrutu(1772 A.D.) in favour of Bakshi Raja Khan Sahib for meritorious services rendered during the attack of Seringapatam by Lord Cornwallis at Karigatta and renewed on 6th November 1816 by His late Highness Sri Krishnarajendra Wadiyar Bahadur of revered memory after the fall of Seringapatam, the Inam village of Dudkatur was given as a present to the said Raja Khan Sahib with full and complete rights of undisturbed and peaceful enjoyment by him and his descendents in perpetuity of all kinds of benefits of the village including the mineral wealth.

3. That on the introduction of Inam Settlement in Mysore in the year 1874 the said Sannads were duly confirmed and admitted by the Inam Settlement Officer under his countersignature and that the Memorialist is at present in possession of the same both by virtue of her being the grand daughter-in-law of the said Raja Khan and of her having lately acquired by purchase all the rights, title and interests of all other descendents of his legal representatives.

4. That the activities which the Memorialist noticed in the year 1919 in connection with the mining of chrome ore in the Mysore and Hassan Districts and especially in her own Inam village of Dudkatur aroused her interest in the minerals occurring therein and she applied without loss of time to Your Highness Government for -

(a) the restoration of the mining rights in her favour in virtue of the terms of the said Sannad,

(b) the grant, pending such restoration, of a prospecting license in favour of the Memorialist under the Rules then in force - - published under Government Notification No. ?.3119-Geol.40-16-2 dated 5th September 1916 for Magnesite, Chrome and other minerals in the said Inam village of Dudkatur, and

(c) the cancellation of the licenses and leases previously granted by Government to certain other parties coming from outside Mysore viz., Messrs.Tata Iron & Steel Co.Ltd. Bombay, and Messrs.Oakley Bowden & Co., Madras, over certain portion of the said Inam village to the detriment of the Memorialist.

5. That the Memorialist has not up to date received any orders from Government in regard to her prayer for the restoration of the mineral rights beyond a simple letter from the Director of the Geological Department written over two years ago on the 12th May 1920 advising the Memorialist to address the Government or the Superintendent of Inam Settlement in the matter.

6. That the provisions in Sec.38 of the Mysore Land Revenue Code of 1888 purporting to forfeit the mineral rights of Inamdars who omitted to establish the same within five years after the passing of that Regulation i.e., before the 22nd November 1893 are not only arbitrary on their own face but also invalid both from legal and moral points of view. Another most significant fact which the Memorialist begs to submit in this connection is that the said provisions occupied such an obscure corner in the Code that even the framer of the Code himself viz., the late Sir P.N.Krishnamurthi, Jaghirdar of Yelandur omitted to establish his rights to minerals within the prescribed period but urged the same a long number of years afterwards. This fact clearly illustrates how helpless widows, minors and others who were at that time ignorant of the passing of such a regulation or even of the gist of the same were in respect of the establishment of the mineral rights graciously conferred upon them by Sannads granted by the Ruling Sovereigns of Mysore. This is a matter of paramount importance which the Memorialist respectfully begs to urge for your Highness' most gracious consideration and she will ever be grateful to your Highness for the restoration of the mineral rights to her under the terms of the Sannad now in her possession and enjoyment as your Highness were gracious enough to restore the same in case of the Sringeri Jaghir long after the time - -

notified in the said regulations.

7. That the mining leases granted in the Inam village to Messrs.Tata Iron & Steel Co. and Messrs.Oakley Bowden and Co. may kindly be ordered to be cancelled pending the settlement of the question of the restoration of mineral rights to the Memorialist, especially in view of the fact that the lessees have not only been unreasonable in their terms to obtain the consent of the Memorialist as far as the surface rights are concerned but have also violated the conditions of the leases in regard to entry upon the lands in the village and to the vigorous working of the block.

8. That the most urgent and immediate matter which the Memorialist begs to urge pending the restoration of the mineral rights as prayed for above is the grant to her of a prospecting license for chrome in her Inam - - village applied for by her as far back as February 1920. The application then submitted by the Memorialist was for a license for magnesite and chrome under the Rules o f September 1916 then in force and it was rejected on the ground that the block applied for was within the area reserved by Government in their Order No.G.24557-62/Geol. 47-18-11 dated 29th April 1920(Vide letter No.657 dated 5/6th October 1920 from the Director, Geological Department) The Memorialist thereupon pointed out that the - application was one submitted before the order of reservation and reiterated her request for the grant of t h e license as originally prayed for, especially in view of the village being an Inam one and also of the mineral -- rights conferred on the Memorialist by the terms of the Sannads held by her. At the same time certain other Inamdars of the said village(whose shares have since been purchased by the Memorialist) having also applied for --

licenses over the same village, the Government declined to grant licenses to the Memorialist or to any other Inamdars on the ground that there existed proprietory disputes in connection with the village(Vide letter No.444 dated 19/20th September 1921 from the Director-in-charge of the Mysore Geological Department) In view of this expressed attitude of the Government, the Memorialist whose interest and anxiety to work for chrome in the village was increasing with the demand for that mineral and the high prices obtainable therefor, purchased at an enormous cost viz., Rs.35,000/- the rights and interests of all the other -- Inamdars with a view to put an end to all proprietory disputes to the satisfaction of Government and submitted -- copies of all purchase documents and other title deeds to the Director of the Geological Department for information on the 24th June 1922 and the original thereof in compliance with his letters Nos.784 dated 13th November 1922 and No. 1114 dated 9th January 1923. The Director has also had the Memorialists proprietory rights thus acquired in respect of the whole of the Inam village enquired into by the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, and on receipt of that -- Officers report and on personal enquiries made by him(the Director) direct, the grant of a license to the Memorialist for Magnesite and chrome was recommended to Government. But most unfortunately to the Memorialist, the Government have sanctioned the license only for Magnesite and rejected the same for Chrome on the ground that "chrome has since been reserved to Government throughout the State"(Vide letter No.1973 dated 12/14th May 1923 from the Director of Geology)

9. That the order of refusal of Government to grant the license for chrome has now come to the Memorialist as a bolt from the blue as the long and protracted enquiries

correspondence and promises made by the Director of Geology filled her with reasonable hopes of her being in position to carry on mining operations on an extensive scale for chrome which commands at present a very favourable market and an attractive return for the outlay on it and induced her to spend a good portion of her wealth in purchasing the rights of the other Inamdars. There is at present little or no demand whatever for Magnesite and in fact it was intended to be worked merely as subsidiary to chrome. A license for magnesite is therefore absolutely of no value. The Memorialists sole anxiety is to work for chrome only and the refusal of a license to her for that mineral would result in her utter ruin as she cannot at all afford to put up with the loss of the heavy sum of Rs.35,000/- invested by her on the - - implied promise of Government to grant the license on the settlement of the "proprietory disputes"

In this connection the Memorialist respectfully begs permission to submit for the gracious consideration of your Highness that there has already been a very wide and - - common feeling among the public that the possibilities of chrome ore being required by Government for the objects of the reservation are far remote and that the reservation tends more largely to seriously hamper the growth of mineral industries and discourage private enterprise. A more pertinent point to be submitted for your Highness' consideration is that the reservation in Inam village is hardly justifiable or even workable. The difficulties and expenses the Government would have to face would also be inconsiderable in connection with the settlement of the claims of the Inamdars whose surface rights would have to be acquired even in the event of the Government having to resort to their lands for mining for chrome (w h i c h

should obviously be done if at all after the other - - resources in the Government lands are exhausted)

The benefits that might accrue to Government by the reservation and the withholding of the license in the small area applied for by the Memorialist would also be quite disproportionate to the losses she would have to sustain thereby and she also respectfully urges for your Highness' gracious consideration that she forms a part and parcel of those whom even such a reservation is - - intended to benefit.

10. That in conclusion the Memorialist prays that in view of the foregoing circumstances and more especially of -

(a) the mineral rights conferred by the Sannads held by her and the arbitrary nature of the provisions of Sec.38 of Land Revenue Code w h i c h apparently is not legally enforceable,

(b) the implied promises of the Government to grant the license on the settlement of the proprietory disputes connected with the village,

(c) the heavy investment of nearly Rs.35,000/- which she was thereby encouraged to make for the -- acquisition of the rights of Inamdars with a view to settle the proprietory disputes,

(d) the prevailing public feeling in regard to the remoteness of the possibilities of Government requiring chrome for industrial purposes,

(e) the difficulties and expensiveness attendant on the settlement of claims in connection with the surface rights in the Inam village in question,

your Highness may be graciously pleased to sanction the grant of a mining lease to the Memorialist for chrome

over the block applied for by her in the Inam village in question pending the restoration of mineral rights granted under the Sannads held by her.

For this act of kindness and generosity t h e Memorialist and her heirs will ever pray for your Highness' long life and prosperity.

She begs to remain
Your Highness' most humble subject
& Servant
(Signed) Khani Begum

Dated 2nd July 23
Mysore City

"True Copy"
Khani Begum

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

Date of issue 15-10-23

Signed by Jr H S R

PUL

Section Genl

File No. 29-23

Serial No. 2

No. J.C. 1960

To Mrs Khan Begum
C/o. Mr. Hyder Ali Khan
Supdt of Police
Chickmagalur.

With reference to her memorial dated 28-8-23 addressed to His Highness the Maharaja for the grant of certain remedial concessions in the Dodkallur inam village in the Mysore State Mrs Khan Begum is informed that ~~there is~~ no reason has been discovered ~~why the~~ to vary the orders passed and communicated by her in the letter No. 23-8-1923. ~~or to grant the grants her request to be reimbursed for the expenditure incurred by her in purchasing the rights of the village shanbhogs in the Dodkallur village.~~

B. O

Mysore 13/10/23

Foreign & Political Dept

over.